Confirmation No.: 4970

REMARKS

The foregoing Amendment is filed in response to the official action dated April 9, 2007. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-61 are currently pending.

Of the above claims, claims 60-61 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-59 stand rejected.

Claims 1-4, 13-16, 26, 31, 33, 37, 46-47, 49-51, 53-54, and 56-58 have been amended.

Claims 25, 27, 35-36, and 39-40 have been canceled without prejudice.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 13-59 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen (USP 5,907,680). The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that base claims 1, 13, 26, 46, and 53, as amended, and the claims depending therefrom, recite non-obvious subject matter that distinguishes over the art of record, and therefore the rejections of claims 1-9 and 13-59 under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be withdrawn.

For example, amended base claim 1 recites a method of enabling information associations that can be performed in

Confirmation No.: 4970

conjunction with at least one client system and at least one server system. As recited in amended claim 1, the method includes accessing, at the client system, at least one document, which contains informational content and has an associated address for The informational use in accessing the informational content. content, which includes parsable data, is accessed at the client system using the address. Further, on the client system or the server system, the parsable data included in the informational content is parsed to identify a number of objects included in the document. Next, from at least one database, information is accessed that is related to those of the identified objects for which related information is available. On a display of the client system, at least some of those identified objects for which related information is available is displayed. Next, on the client system, a selection by a user is detected of one of the objects displayed on the display. On the client display, information from the database is then displayed related to the selected one of the objects.

The official action indicates that the Nielsen reference discloses parsing data contained within a document to identify a number of objects included in the document (i.e., sending a request for a particular "www" document). Specifically, the

Confirmation No.: 4970

Nielsen reference, which relates to spell-checking of resource identifications in a network environment, teaches manually entering a uniform resource locator (URL) on a browser, and, if the browser receives a "Server Not Found" error, performing, on a client-side component, a spelling check on the protocol and domain-name portions of the URL, creating a list of potentially valid URLs, and displaying the list in hypertext format. A user can then select one of the URLs displayed in the list (see column 5, line 66, to column 6, line 41, of Nielsen).

More specifically, the Nielsen reference discloses a process for the spelling checker operation that includes, upon invocation, creating an empty list, and then parsing the first URL component from a complete URL. Next, an attempt is made to retrieve a "tuple" {server name, component name} from a database, where the server name from the URL matches the server name in the database. If the attempt is unsuccessful, then the database contains no matching entries to the URL's server name. Alternatively, if the attempt was successful, then the URL component and the retrieved database component are assigned to temporary variables, and the spelling check algorithm is invoked. If a match was found, then a match indicator will have a value of TRUE, the database component that matched the URL component will replace the URL component in

the URL, and the revised URL will be added to the list of potentially valid URLs. If there are more URL components to process, then the next component is parsed from the URL, and the process begins again. Otherwise, if there are no more URL components, then the process halts, returning the list of potentially valid URLs (see column 7, line 47, to column 8, line 23, and Fig. 4, of Nielsen).

Based at least upon the excerpts from the Nielsen reference provided above, the Applicants respectfully submit that Nielsen does not disclose parsing parsable data included in the informational content contained within a document to identify a number of objects included in the document, as recited in amended base claim 1, but instead discloses parsing URL components from a complete URL to perform a spelling check on the protocol and domain-name portions of the URL. As is known, a URL corresponds to the global address of a document on the world wide web. A URL does not correspond to parsable data such as words, phrases, graphics, etc., included in the informational content contained within a document.

The Applicants have amended base claim 1 to recite more definitively that the accessed document contains informational content and has an associated address for use in accessing the

Confirmation No.: 4970

informational content. The Applicants have further amended claim 1 to recite that parsable data included in the informational content of the document is parsed to identify a number of objects (e.g., words, phrases, graphics, etc.) included in the document. Unlike the spelling check algorithm of the Nielsen reference which includes the step of parsing URL components from a complete URL (i.e., the global address) of a web page, the method of amended claim 1 includes parsing data included in the informational content contained within a document. The Applicants respectfully point out that the address associated with a document is not part of the informational content of the document, but is used to access the informational content over a network.

As described in the present application, the claimed system and method of enabling information associations operates by parsing parsable data (e.g., words, phrases, graphics, etc.) included in the informational content of a document such as a web page downloadable by a browser program running on a client system, and using the parsed data to form a list of "meta-links" (or "meta-link objects") within the document for which related information may be available. For example, the list of meta-link objects may be formed by generating a unique object list for the document, and forwarding that list to a metadata server, which may

respond with a list of those objects that are associated with related information.

In this way, the claimed system and method can empower a user to pursue related or tangential interests while "surfing" through various web pages. For example, instead of forcing the user to choose from a small subset of the words or phrases within a document that happen to be conventionally "linkable" objects, the claimed system potentially makes every object on a web page linkable by associating every object with related "metadata" (see page 4, lines 8-19, and page 6, line 27, to page 7, line 2, of the application). Clearly, a spelling check algorithm that merely provides a user with a list of alternative URL spellings, as disclosed by Nielsen, would not provide that user with the benefit of empowering him/her to pursue related or tangential interests while surfing the web, like the method of amended base claim 1.

Because the Nielsen reference neither teaches nor suggests a method of enabling information associations that includes accessing at least one document that contains informational content and has an associated address for use in accessing the informational content, parsing parsable data included in the informational content to identify a number of objects included in the document, accessing, from at least one database, information

related to those identified objects for which related information is available, displaying at least some of those identified objects for which related information is available, detecting a selection by a user of one of the objects displayed on the display, and displaying information from the database related to the selected one of the objects, as recited in amended base claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Nielsen reference does not anticipate amended claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom.

For at least the reasons discussed above with reference to amended base claim 1, the Applicants further submit that the Nielsen reference does not anticipate amended base claims 13, 26, 46, and 53 and the claims depending therefrom. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 1-9 and 13-59 under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Gershman et al. (USP 6,199,099). The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the Gershman reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Nielsen reference, and therefore the combined teachings of the Nielsen and Gershman references would not suggest to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of the invention the subject matter of claims

10-12, which depend directly or indirectly from amended base claim
1.

example, the Gershman reference discloses, in one For embodiment, a system for preparing an individual for an upcoming meeting by helping him/her retrieve relevant information about the Using the Gershman system, input meeting from various sources. text in character form is received indicative of the target Such input text can be generated by a calendar program that includes the time of the meeting. As the meeting time approaches, the calendar program is queried to obtain the text of the target event, and that information is utilized as an input to an agent, which parses the input meeting text to extract its body, participants, the title, various components such as Pattern matching is also performed to location, time, etc. identify particular meeting fields in the meeting text. This information is utilized to query various sources of information on the web, and to obtain relevant stories about the current meeting to send back to the calendar program. In this way, the Gershman system updates the calendar program, and eventually provides the user with the best information it can gather to prepare him/her for the target meeting. The gathered information is stored in a

file that is obtained via selection from a link embedded in the calendar system (see column 10, lines 33-63, of Gershman et al.).

The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that like the Nielsen reference, the Gershman reference neither teaches nor suggests the method of amended base claim 1, which recites accessing at least one document containing informational content and having an associated address for use in accessing the informational content, parsing parsable data included in the informational content to identify a number of objects included in the document, accessing, from at least one database, information related to those identified objects for which related information is available, displaying at least some of those identified objects for which related information by a user of one of the objects displayed on the display, and displaying information from the database related to the selected one of the objects.

For example, as discussed above, the Gershman system employs information such as the various components of input meeting text and particular meeting fields within the meeting text to query sources of information on the web, and to obtain relevant stories about a current meeting. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Gershman et al. neither teach nor suggest at least

Application No.: 09/628,880 Filed: July 31, 2000

TC Art Unit: 2151

Confirmation No.: 4970

the steps of displaying at least some of those identified objects (e.g., at least some of the meeting text components and meeting fields) for which related information is available, detecting a user selection of one of the displayed objects, and displaying information from the database related to the selected object, as recited in amended base claim 1. Instead, as discussed above, the information gathered by the Gershman system is stored in a file that can be obtained via selection from a link embedded in a calendar system.

Because the Gershman reference fails to cure the deficiencies of the Nielsen reference, the combined teachings of the Nielsen and Gershman references would not suggest to one skilled in this art at the time of the invention the subject matter of dependent claims 10-12. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned Attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES S. ROSEN ET AL.

Richard E. Gamache

Registration No. 39,196 Attorney for Applicants

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,
GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP
Ten Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109

Telephone: (617) 542-2290 Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

REG/pjd Enclosure

354145.1